

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed May 17, 2004 has been reviewed and the comments of the Patent and Trademark Office have been considered. Claims 1-28 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 5, 10, 12, 14, 19, 21, 23, and 28 have been amended and no claims have been canceled or newly added. Therefore, claims 1-28 are pending in the application.

FIG. 2 has been amended to address the issues raised in the Office Action. One formal drawing Replacement Sheet for this figure is attached hereto.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Claim 3 is objected to for minor informalities. Applicants have amended this claim to improve its readability. The earlier text corresponded to terminology conventionally used with Markush groups in claim drafting practice and was equivalent to the current recitation. Therefore, the scope of this claim has not been changed in any way.

Claims 3, 5, 12, 14, 21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants traverse this rejection with respect to the pending claims for at least the following reasons. *First*, the originally filed claims (which are a part of the disclosure) as well as paragraphs 10 and 12 in the specification supported this feature in the pending claims. *Second*, providing suggestions to a user based on his application selections and validating or verifying those selections is supported at least by paragraph 38 which discloses verifying whether a user has rights to a particular viewlets and only then defining these viewlets in the user context. That is, the personalization engine provides feedback to the user on whether certain viewlets are appropriate based on, for example, access rights of the user to an application or particular viewlets within the application. Accordingly, applicants believe that the pending claims are supported by the originally filed specification and these claims meet the requirement of the § 112, first paragraph.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 6-11, 15-20, and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 6,571,245 to Huang et al (hereafter "Huang"). Claims 3, 5, 12, 14, 21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable

over Huang in view of U.S. patent 5,925,103 to Magallanes et al. (hereafter “Magallanes”). Claims 4, 13, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of U.S. patent 6,512,526 to McGlothlin et al. (hereafter “McGlothlin”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Each of the independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 28 recite, *inter alia*, rendering a custom view based on a user context based on a defined activity sequence received from a user. The defined activity sequence comprises at least two viewlets from two applications, respectively, where a viewlet defines a coherent set of operations performed by an application. See paragraph 30 of the specification that defines a viewlet. See also the example in the specification in paragraph 49 which discloses that the exemplary viewlets that comprise the activity sequence include icons for coherent operations such as “read e-mail, create document, create presentation, send e-mail,” whereby specific viewlets represent operations in applications that are specified to define an activity sequence. This generation of custom views for users based on an activity sequence of viewlets from different applications is not disclosed or suggested by Huang.

Specifically, the office action cites to col. 14 and Fig. 11 of Huang for disclosing these claimed features. However, the cited portions of Huang only disclosing customizing a desktop by selecting particular applications for the desktop. There is simply no teaching or suggestion defining viewlets from different applications in an activity sequence. For example, the customization window 1130 in Fig. 11 of Huang discloses an icon listing 1132 which lists the applications and files which can be selected but there is no teaching of selecting particular viewlets from two or more applications as required by the pending independent claims. Item description listing 1134 lists items that may be associated with an application (for example, a list of bookmarks with a browser) but there is no teaching of selecting particular viewlets from two or more applications so that a custom view for a user facilitates an activity sequence. Therefore, neither the claimed features in the independent claims nor its advantages are disclosed or suggested by Huang.

Furthermore, these deficiencies of Huang are not cured by any of the other applied references. Therefore, the office action fails to make a case of *prima facie* obviousness with respect to the pending independent claims.

The dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional reasons for their patentability when considered as a whole.

For example, claims 4, 13, and 22 relate to defining an activity sequence (that is, a sequence of viewlets) based on a role of the user. This recited feature is also not disclosed or suggested by the applied prior art and provides an additional reason for the patentability of these claims.

In view of the above, applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. An early notice of the same is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account No. 19-0741 for any such fees; and applicants hereby petition for any needed extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date August 16, 2004

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 672-5485

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Aaron C. Chatterjee

William T. Ellis

Registration No. 26,874

Aaron C. Chatterjee

Registration No. 41,398

Attorneys for Applicants